

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 7-8 and 14-16 are amended; and Claims 17-20 are added by the present amendment. Support for the new and amended claims can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings.<sup>1</sup> No new matter is presented.

In the Final Office Action of August 25, 2008 (herein, the Final Office Action), Claim 16 and the specification are objected to because of minor informalities; Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 1-5, 8-12 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kondo et al. (U.S. Pub. 2004/0021775, herein Kondo '775); Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kondo '775 in view of Wang et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,557,684, herein Wang); and Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kondo '775 in view of Wang and Kondo et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,940,539, herein Kondo '539).

The Final Office Action objects to Claim 16, recommending that Claim 16 recite “output section” instead of “output”. In response, Claim 16 is amended as recommended in the Final Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 16 be withdrawn.

Regarding the objections to the specification and abstract, Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the indication in the Advisory Action of November 18, 2008 (herein, the Advisory Action) that the amendment to the specification presented in the response filed October 24, 2008 has been entered, and that the objection to the specification has been withdrawn. Regarding the objection to the abstract, the abstract is amended herein to

---

<sup>1</sup> e.g., at least at paragraphs [0126]-[0129] of the published version of the application (US 2006/0192857).

incorporate the change noted in the Final Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

The Final Office Action rejects Claims 7 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. In response, Claims 7 and 14 are amended to remove the phrase “class tap”, which is cited as the basis of this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 7 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-5, 8-12 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Kondo ‘775. In response to this rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 recite novel features not disclosed by Kondo ‘775.

Amended independent Claim 1, for example, recites, in part an apparatus for processing an image, comprising:

motion vector detection means for detecting a motion vector about a moving object that moves in multiple images ...  
motion-blurring-mitigated object image generation means for generating a motion-blurring-mitigated object image ... and  
output means for combining the motion-blurring-mitigated object image that is generated in the motion-blurring-mitigated object image generation means *into a space-time location in each image based on the motion vector detected by the motion vector detection means*, to output it as a motion-blurring-mitigated image.

Independent Claims 8 and 15-16, while directed to alternative embodiments, recite similar features. Accordingly, the remarks and arguments presented below are applicable to each of independent Claims 1, 8, 15 and 16.

Turning to the applied reference, Kondo ‘775 describes an image processing device that detects a movement vector of a moving object by detecting a mixture ratio indicating the proportion of mixing with an image, or taking into consideration a region mixed with the

image.<sup>2</sup> As described in paragraphs [0334]-[0336], Kondo ‘775’s apparatus includes a blurring adjustment unit 106 that uses a movement vector to adjust movement blurring amounts contained in foreground component images.

Kondo ‘775, however, fails to teach or suggest that his apparatus “combin[es] the motion-blurring-mitigated object image ... *into a space-time location in each image based on the motion vector detected by the motion vector detection means*, to output it as a motion-blurring-mitigated image”, as recited in independent Claim 1. Otherwise stated, Kondo ‘775 fails to disclose using a motion vector corresponding to the object to determine where the mitigated object image is to be placed in a space-time location in each image, as recited in amended independent Claim 1.

In rejecting the claimed features directed to the “output means”, the Final Office Action relies on Fig. 137 of Kondo ‘775 noting the “Image Synthesizing Unit”, where the ‘Background Component Image’ and the ‘Foreground Component Image’ are combined”. As described at paragraphs [1154]-[1158] of Kondo ‘775, in the synthesizing unit 4001, a background component creating unit 4021 generates a background component image based on the mixture ratio  $\alpha$  and the arbitrary background image, and supplies this to a mixed region image synthesizing unit 4022. The mixed region image synthesizing unit 4022 synthesizes the background component image supplied from the background component creating unit 4021 with the foreground component image to generate a mixed region synthesized image, and supplies the generated mixed region synthesized image to an image synthesizing unit 4023. The image synthesizing unit 4023 synthesizes the foreground component image, mixed region synthesized image supplied from the mixed region image synthesizing unit 4022, and the arbitrary background image, to generate and output a

---

<sup>2</sup> Kondo, Abstract.

synthesized image. Thus, the synthesizing unit 4001 can synthesize a foreground component image with an arbitrary background image.

Accordingly, the synthesizing unit combines the foreground component images with background images, but fails to disclose that such a synthesis is performed by “combining the motion-blurring-mitigated object image ... *into a space-time location in each image based on the motion vector detected by the motion vector detection means*, to output it as a motion-blurring-mitigated image”, as recited in independent Claim 1. More particularly, Kondo ‘775 fails to disclose using the motion vector corresponding to the moving object to determine where the motion-blurring-mitigated object image should be placed in the image, whatsoever.

Further, the Advisory Action cites Fig. 2 of Kondo ‘775 noting that the foreground component image is based on the movement vector. As described at paragraphs [0318]-[0338] of Kondo ‘775, however, the signal processing device of Fig. 2 merely detects, corrects, and outputs the foreground component images. The signal processing device in Fig. 2, therefore, does not output a motion vector corresponding to the foreground component image, nor does it “combine the motion-blurring-mitigated object image ... *into a space-time location in each image based on the motion vector detected by the motion vector detection means*, to output it as a motion-blurring-mitigated image”, as recited in independent Claim 1.

Therefore, Kondo ‘775 fails to disclose an apparatus for processing an image including “output means for combining the motion-blurring-mitigated object image that is generated in the motion-blurring-mitigated object image generation means *into a space-time location in each image based on the motion vector detected by the motion vector detection means*, to output it as a motion-blurring-mitigated image” as recited in independent Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 (and Claims 2-5 which depend therefrom) under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn. For substantially similar

reasons, it is also submitted that independent Claims 8 (and Claims 9-12 which depend therefrom), 12 and 15-16 patentably define over Kondo.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 6-7 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Kondo '775 in view of Wang and/or Kondo '539, Applicants note that Claims 6-7 and 13-14 depend from independent Claims 1 and 8, respectively, and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Wang nor Kondo '539 remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Kondo '775.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 6-7 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Further, new Claims 17-20 are presented, which depend from Claims 1, 8, 15 and 16, and are therefore believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that new dependent Claims 17-20 recite novel features that further define over the applied references.

Application No. 10/552,467  
Reply to Office Action of August 25, 2008

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-16 is definite and patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Andrew T. Harry  
Registration No. 56,959

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)